

### **SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW**

Applicant's representatives would like to thank Examiner Poltorak for granting a telephonic interview, which was conducted on January 7, 2009. Differences between the claimed invention and the prior art were discussed. Examiner Poltorak offered helpful suggestions for amending the claims to reflect that the selection of experts occurs near in time to the attempted downloading of content, which Examiner Poltorak agrees does not appear to be taught by the cited art of record.

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed October 21, 2008 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 5-15, 18-20, and 22-28 stand rejected, and claim 21 stands objected to. Claims 1, 14, 18, and 27 have been amended herein. Claims 1, 2, 5-15, and 18-28 remain pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present Application.

## **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out allowable subject matter in claim 21.

## **Objections**

Claim 18 stands objected to on the grounds that it depends from canceled claim 17. Claim 18 has been amended herein to depend from pending claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 18.

Claim 21 stands objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but the Office Action notes that claim 21 would overcome the art of record if rewritten in independent form.

## **Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 13-15, 18-20 and 26-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul Johns, “Signing and Marking ActiveX Controls” (hereinafter referred to as “Johns”) in view of IE as illustrated by Microsoft, Schnoll, Acd. Ucar. Edu and Resource Kit, “Microsoft Internet Explorer Resource Kit”, February, 1998 (hereinafter referred to as “IE”). Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein the expert selection box is provided when the user is presented with the first and second trust

options.” Applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion of this feature in the cited art of record.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims 2, 5-7, and 13 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 13.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite, in part, “receiving a selection of one or more experts from a listing of experts that is presented when the user is presented with an option of downloading the content, wherein each of the one or more selected experts comprises an individual user other than the first user.” Applicant has carefully reviewed the art of record in light of these amendments. The asserted combination of art of record fails to teach or suggest receiving a selection of one or more experts when the user is presented with an option of downloading the content.

The asserted combination of art of record also fails to teach or suggest “each expert comprises an individual user other than the first user.” Specifically, the Office Action appears to characterize the “Custom Level . . .” and “Default Level” of IE to read on experts and the IE developers to read on users. However, as Internet Explorer is an application, and therefore is, at best, a product of the various inputs of numerous programmers and developers, an aspect of it cannot be fairly characterized as *an individual user other than the first user*.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 14, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims 15, 18-20, and 26 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these

dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 14, 15, 18-20, and 26.

Independent claim 27 has been amended to recite, in part, “wherein the expert selection box is provided when the user is presented with an option of downloading the content.” As discussed above with respect to amended independent claims 1 and 14, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Independent claim 27 has been further amended herein to recite, in part, “receiving a selection of one or more experts, wherein each of the one or more selected experts comprises an individual user other than the first user.” As discussed above, with respect to amended independent claim 14, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest these limitations and, therefore, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended independent claim 27.

Independent claim 27 has been further amended to recite “wherein computing said recommendation comprises determining whether the one or more selected experts previously trusted content of a similar type as the requested content.” Applicant is unable to find any teaching or suggestion of this feature in the cited art of record. Furthermore, as the Office Action considers the “Custom Level . . .” and “Default Level” of IE to read on experts, it appears that the Office Action is characterizing configurable security settings as experts. As such, these security settings would not have been able to make trust decisions previously because they are simply settings, and settings are incapable of making trust decisions. Accordingly, the art of record fails to teach or suggest this feature.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 27, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Claim 28 depends directly from independent claim 27. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 27 and 28.

Dependent claims 9-12 and 22-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns in view of IE and further in view of Windows OS as illustrated by Microsoft, “Microsoft “Windows 2000 User Profiles”, July 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “Windows OS”) and TechNet, Microsoft TechNet, “User Profile Structure” and “Appendix: Group Policy Setting for Roaming User Profiles”, March 2002 (hereinafter referred to as “TechNet”). As discussed above, the combination of Johns and IE fails to render the amended independent claims obvious. Furthermore, the combination of Windows OS and TechNet fails to teach or suggest the amended limitations, nor is the combination relied upon as doing so. Combining both sets of references does nothing to alter the analysis. Each of claims 9-12 and 22-25 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 14 respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-12 and 22-25.

Claims 1, 11-15 and 24-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns in view of Windows OS, TechNet and Peter Hipson, “Windows 2000 Registry”, ISBN: 0782126154, 2000 (hereinafter referred to as “Hipson”) and further in view of IE as illustrated by Schnoll and Acd.Ucar.Edu. Independent claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended herein. As discussed above, IE, Johns, Windows OS, and TechNet fail, both

individually and in combination, to render the independent claims obvious. Further, Hipson does not teach or suggest, individually or in combination with the other references, the amended limitations recited in the independent claims, nor is it relied upon as doing so. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims 11-13, 15, and 24-26 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 14, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 11-15, and 24-27.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-2, 5-15 and 18-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or [plujin@shb.com](mailto:plujin@shb.com) (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. Other than the \$130 extension fee discussed above, it is believed that no fee is due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick Lujin/

Patrick A. Lujin  
Reg. No. 35,260

PAL/RCO/ksd  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
816-474-6550